THEOLOGY

VOL. LX SEPTEMBER, 1957 No. 447

Editorial

IT is not fashionable nowadays to talk about the "social gospel" or the "social implications of the Faith", but the kind of Christian outlook which those expressions bespoke is as much needed as ever—more than ever, if Mr Maurice Reckitt is right in supposing that the Church of England has been falling back in this regard since the death of William Temple. Mr Reckitt's new book, *Militant here in earth*,[1] if it does nothing else, makes us wonder whether or not there is such a falling back. Readers should not be put off by the book's deplorable cover which depicts an ugly, magnified human ear along with an ugly, miniature pulpit.

In wishing to see the Church more militant, Mr Reckitt has no idea of prompting the Archbishop of Canterbury to emulate Archbishop Makarios' engagement with the world. It is perhaps a defect, as well as a merit, that his attention is concentrated almost entirely on the English scene. It is not easy to see that his prophetic aspirations would ring any bells for the people of Cyprus. But then he does not intend them to do so. He is reiterating the message of the Christendom group, as it used to be called, and it is well that it should be reiterated, for little is heard now of that select and high-powered but ageing company of Christian social thinkers. This would not matter if another group had arisen to take its place and carry further the critique of contemporary society which they began and took to a very high level. Possibly more is going on to-day than Mr Reckitt is aware of, but we can certainly still do with him to press upon us the question whether there is a coherent Christian doctrine of society which can give illumination and hope to men who are immersed in the perplexities of the age.

He himself appears to think that we ought to be able to articulate not only a Christian doctrine of society but a doctrine of a Christian society. Indeed, he goes so far as to say that "about the possibility and need, and in general the nature, of a Christian society there should not be any controversy among Christians at all" (p. 79). By a Christian society Mr Reckitt does not of course mean a reproduction of medieval Christendom though he does mean something analogous to that, which would be clearly distinguished from a neutral or secular society or civilization. We, on the other hand, think that Cardinal Newman, somewhat surprisingly in this case, showed prophetic insight in rejecting the ideal of a Catholic or Christian (which in the context means the same thing) civilization. Writing to T. W. Allies he said: "I do not see my way to hold that 'Catholic Civilisation', as you describe it, is in *fact* (I do not say in

[1] *Considerations on the prophetic function of the Church in the twentieth century*. Longmans. 9s. 6d.

the abstract), but in fact, has been, or shall be, or can be, a good, or *per se* desirable."[1] However, although in the earlier part of his book, Mr Reckitt attaches much importance to agreement about the kind of Christian society we should be aiming at, at a later point he says that "there is again need to learn how to live without a clear secular hope" (p. 101), and that "God's work in civilization has not necessarily—or even probably—to be done in the way which would most appeal to us" (p. 103). That is well said and, subject to that proviso, Mr Reckitt makes many salutary points about the duty of the Church "in this technical age". Perhaps he is too ready to repeat that "the Church must do" this or that, without indicating precisely who in the Church is expected to do precisely what. This was always a failing of the Christendom group;[2] it could be excused on the ground that its job was one for intellectuals and not for men of action.

Mr Reckitt, though a partial exception to his own rule (he must be accounted a quasi-ecclesiastic), curiously leaves the impression—which is enforced by the cover design—that the militant or prophetic task of the Church can be best performed by clergymen saying or writing things, rather than by laymen doing things which make a difference to what is actually happening in the world. Thus in his final chapter, after discussing "two personalities as different (!) as Figgis and Temple" as "Twentieth-century Prophets", he goes on to mention a number of others, everyone of whom was a cleric. Could he have named no lay militants who have acted with prophetic insight and effect in government, in industry, in scientific pursuits, in the trade union movement, etc.?

* * * * *

Since for some years to come the question of revising the canon law is likely to continue to be agitated in the Church of England, it is desirable that accurate information about the historical background of the present situation should be available in convenient form. Canon E. W. Kemp's book, *An Introduction to Canon Law in the Church of England*,[3] admirably serves this purpose. He deals with the history of the subject from the Middle Ages onwards with great clarity and a wealth of quotation and illustration.

---

[1] Quoted in T. Kenny, *The Political Thought of J. H. Newman*, p. 134. Allies had said that "Catholic Civilisation . . . was the ideal which the Church aimed at in the Middle Ages, and which she worked into the laws, manners, institutions, public policy, or public opinion of Europe".

[2] Other characteristic failings are noticeable in this book, e.g. the paying of compliments to other members of the group, a practice which always gave it something of the air of a mutual admiration society, and also the idealization of the leadership of William Temple particularly at the Malvern Conference of 1941. For Mr Reckitt's own account of the development of the Christendom group, see his article "Challenge and Response" in THEOLOGY, June 1953, pp. 208–215.

[3] Hodder and Stoughton, 8s. 6d.

Letter from Cyprus

MANY people in Western Europe have been profoundly shocked to find that a Prince of the Orthodox Church should not only have become a political figure of great importance, but that he should apparently be directly concerned with conspiracy, terrorism and murder. The discovery has aroused no such emotion in Greece or in other parts of the Levant. I do not propose to put forward an apologia for the course which Archbishop Makarios has taken, for this can safely be left to Athens Radio. Nor do I wish in any way to condone terrorism or murder or conspiracy. All I desire to do is to explain some of the historical reasons why expressions such as "the Church Militant" have a very different meaning to Greeks from that which they bear in Western Europe.

It would, I suppose, be fair to say that in Western Europe one would have to go back many centuries to find an ecclesiastical personage whose political importance was as great as that of Makarios in Cyprus to-day. In terms of purely political power, the closest parallel would probably be the medieval churchmen who in England held the office of Chancellor—men like Becket or William of Wykeham or Cardinal Beaufort or of course Wolsey, who were really the Prime Ministers of their day. Archbishop Laud is perhaps a borderline case, but I exclude him because the conflicts of the seventeenth century were largely religious, and it was mainly because of this that Laud happened to become an important figure. And I think it is also fair to say that one of the principal reasons why in medieval times churchmen rose to positions of such high importance was that it was only from among the ranks of the clergy that our rulers could find the ability needed to administer a bureaucracy of growing complexity. Elsewhere in Western Europe there were other reasons why clerics acquired political importance. In a Catholic country like France, for instance, where there was a theoretical union between Church and State, it was only natural that the Chief Minister of His Catholic Majesty should occasionally be a Cardinal like Richelieu. At all events, throughout Western Europe the voice of the Church is rarely heard to-day on political matters, except where some great moral issue is involved.

With the Orthodox Church things have always been entirely different. From the earliest days of the Arab conquest of the Syrian and Anatolian possessions of the Byzantine Empire, the Ummayads of the seventh and eighth centuries adopted a remarkably enlightened policy towards their subject peoples. Being outside the pale of Moslem law, these peoples were barred from service in the Moslem army and were forced to pay taxes on an unusually heavy scale. But they were allowed the jurisdiction of their own canon laws as administered by the heads of their own religious communities. The reason for this was simply that Islam is not only a religion but the fountain-head of the laws under which the faithful must live, and to a Moslem it is a contradiction in terms that Islamic law should be applicable to an infidel. So long as you remained an infidel, there-

fore, the Commander of the Faithful expected you to be answerable to the head of your own particular religious community, and quite inevitably he thus became a person of great political importance.

The policy of the Ummayads was continued by the Abbasids, and taken over from them by the founders of the Ottoman Empire. And from the fall of Constantinople in the fifteen century until the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the system remained in substance unchanged. It was a similar difficulty which gave rise to the famous Capitulations, whereby subjects of Western European countries who resided in the Ottoman Empire had their own local courts, administered by their own consular officials. But the position of the Greek Orthodox Christians who lived in the Ottoman Empire was different from that of their neighbours who came from the nation-states of Western Europe. For until 1830 there was no such thing as a nation-state of Greece, and so of course there was no such thing as a Greek consul. All the subjects of the Sultan who belonged to the Orthodox Church, wherever they lived and whatever their language, continued to be regarded by the Ottoman Empire as a separate community for administrative purposes. That community was known as the Millet-i-Rum, and the Patriarch of Constantinople was recognized by the Porte as its head. "Rum" was the Turkish word for Roman, and no Ottoman Turk made any distinction between Roman or Byzantine or Greek. "Millet" means a religious community, so that "Millet-i-Rum" stands for the Greek religious community. Its Greek equivalent is "Ethnarchy", the government of the community.

When the Turks conquered Cyprus from the Venetians in 1571, they set up a similar system in that island. The Orthodox Church of Cyprus had been autocephalous since the ninth century, that is to say that from the practical point of view the Archbishop enjoyed a certain degree of independence from the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. But to the Turks the Archbishop was just the head of another Millet-i-Rum, and the relations of Archbishop and Patriarch were no problem to them. The practical results of this arrangement were described by William Turner, a retired British diplomat, who visited the island in 1815. "Cyprus", he wrote, "though nominally under the authority of a Bey appointed by the Capetan Pasha, is in fact governed by the Greek archbishop and his subordinate clergy." It is true he adds that "a Greek, who seldom possesses power, becomes immediately intoxicated by it when given him, and from a contemptible sycophant is changed instantaneously to a rapacious tyrant". That, however, is irrelevant to my point. What I am trying to say is that the political history of the East Mediterranean is such that it provides a special reason why the Orthodox Church for centuries should have found it quite impossible to keep out of politics. And of course in Cyprus the British inevitably had to adopt a similar system, if for no other reason than that there had never been a really representative institution in the island since it came under British rule, and no legislative body of any kind since the upheaval of 1931. The result is that the Archbishop of Cyprus, whether he likes it or not, must be a political figure, to-day as 100 years ago, and through-

out the period of the British occupation he has retained the title of Ethnarch.

The political importance of the Orthodox clergy under the Arabs and the Ottoman Empire had another consequence. The Greek Church was the only Greek institution which was not destroyed by the Arabs and the Turks. It consequently became the only practical means of preserving among the illiterate masses that consciousness of being different which is the basis of nationalism. It was the Orthodox Church in Serbia and Rumania and Bulgaria which was the nucleus of the nationalist movements in those countries, and it was certainly the Orthodox Church in Greece which was the mainspring of the Greek revolution of 1821. This view, that it was the Church which kept nationalism alive, is I know contested by the great historian George Finlay, but he was a notorious anti-clerical. It is at any rate a matter of historical record that it was the Orthodox Church which pressed for *enosis* between the Ionian islands and Greece in the 'sixties, and was involved in the Cretan revolutions from the Turks of 1896, 1897 and 1912. The Orthodox Church also played an important part in organizing the resistance of the Greeks against the Germans and Italians in 1941 and 1942. And it should not be forgotten that not so long ago the British themselves found the political importance of the Orthodox Church exceedingly useful. After the liberation of Greece in 1944 and the revolution by which it was almost immediately followed it soon became clear that, in a country so bitterly divided on the issue of the monarchy, the only suitable person who could be found to act as Head of the State was the Archbishop, Damaskinos. It is said that as he drove to his first meeting with the Archbishop, Sir Winston Churchill remarked to one of his secretaries: "I trust that we shall have to deal with a scheming medieval prelate." It is a matter of record that in this hope he was not disappointed.

All this may perhaps explain why Greeks in Cyprus and elsewhere do not find it strange that Archbishop Makarios should be an important political figure. It does not of course explain why they are not shocked to find him associated with violence. I would repeat that I do not seek to condone the part which the Grivas diaries seem to prove he has played. I shall merely try to explain the attitude of the Levant to the association of the Orthodox Church with violence and conspiracy. The first and most obvious reason for this attitude is that until the Greek nation-state came into being, the government under which the Greeks were living was a Moslem government, and for the Orthodox Church to encourage violent resistance to a Moslem government, when it became practical politics to do so, did not seem to the Greek mind very different from a Crusade such as those preached centuries before by great churchmen like Peter the Hermit and St Bernard of Clairvaux, and indeed a whole series of occupants of the Papal throne.

That the Church should conspire against the occupying power is a tradition that is well known and well understood throughout the Greek-speaking world. Of this the most striking illustration is the

case of the *Filiki Etairea*, or Friendly Society, a secret association formed in the early part of the last century to work for the independence of Greece from the Turks. In it the priests, and especially Archbishop Germanos, played a major part. Every schoolboy in Greece and Cyprus is taught that it was Germanos who, on 25 March 1821, gave the signal for the revolt by raising the standard of the Cross from the monastery of Aghia Lavra in Achaia. Historians dispute whether it was a white cross on a blue ground or a black cross on a red ground, and indeed whether Germanos really meant the revolution to begin at all at that particular moment, but to this day 25 March is celebrated in Greece and in normal times in Cyprus as Greek Independence Day; and Germanos remains the hero of the story. And in the last war many priests and several bishops were actively encouraged, not least by the British officers in the mountains, to take part with the Greek guerrillas in armed resistance against the Germans. Indeed, after the liberation the Bishops of Kozani and Elis lost their sees for doing so, though it is significant that the reason why they were removed was not that they had had a hand in violence, but that in doing so they had unwittingly supported the Communist resistance movement.

Bearing all this in mind, I do not think we should find it strange that the Greeks are prepared to accept the behaviour of Makarios more readily than others. We should not forget that in this matter of Cyprus the British appear to have deliberately set the Turks against the Greeks, and that from the point of view of the Greek Cypriot the British are firmly allied to the Turks. The atavistic hatred of Turk for Greek can very easily be brought to the surface, as was seen in the ghastly outbreak of anti-Greek violence in Istanbul in September 1955, and its repercussions in Greece. We should not therefore be surprised to find that the Greek expects his churchmen to behave as they behaved in 1821, and to lead another crusade against the occupiers by condoning and encouraging, if not actually organizing, violent resistance to them.

Of this at any rate I am quite certain, that the situation in Cyprus had reached a point some two years ago in which the only alternative left to the Greek Cypriots was violence or complete submission. Given that the Greek Cypriots had opted for violence, I do not see how we could properly expect the Orthodox Church to stand apart and attempt to wash its hands of what was going on. To have done so would have been for the Church to make a complete break with all its historical background and all its traditions. I do not suppose that at the outset Makarios had any intention of associating himself directly with the terrorists, but whatever his intentions may have been, it was inevitable that in the end the Church of Cyprus should have become a Church Militant in the literal and bloody sense of the word. During the last war we had some experience of how revolutions are made in these countries. We found that the moving spirits are generally active people of whom nobody had ever heard before, and more often than not were scallywags. But a point was always reached in the conspiracy at which they complained that they could

get no further without the support—secret, of course, but unquestioned and unquestioning—of some well-known personage. The personage was approached and his support was obtained—on condition that the conspirators would ensure that at all times he himself should be seen to keep his hands clean. But when once the revolution began, he would find that somehow or other the news got out that he was behind it. As it proceeded, he would come to the conclusion that he might as well be hung for a sheep as a lamb; and human nature being human nature, the prospect of having a square named after him would have its attractions. He would therefore allow himself to admit that he was from the start associated with the movement in all its phases, and with this of course he accepted the consequences—that people would know his hands were far from clean. So I believe it may have been with Makarios.

At all events, I think it was futile to maintain that nothing could be done with the Archbishop until he denounced terrorism, and it is equally futile to say that we must not now have anything to do with him because he continues to refuse to do so. For one thing, great pains have been taken to prove that he has been associated from the start with the terrorists, and to expect him to denounce them now is to expect him to eat his words. Moreover, now that he is known to have been associated with the terrorists, why should he throw away his best card by denouncing them? Is it not more reasonable from his point of view to refrain from playing this card until he knows what concessions terrorism is likely to extract? Sooner or later we shall have to recognize that the Archbishop is not only the acknowledged leader of the Greek Cypriot community, but that he is the *only* Greek Cypriot leader with whom we can negotiate. The national heroes, and often the first Prime Ministers, of those countries which have broken away from the British Empire and have achieved their independence—Zaghlul, U Saw, Gandhi, Nehru and Nkrumah, for instance—have generally had to spend some time in jail, or in detention in one of the Empire's most distant island possessions. Makarios has now graduated through the same hard school, and it is a safe bet that his end will be the same as theirs.

Gradations of Authority

THE purpose of this article is to suggest a framework within which authority can be discussed, more especially as it is met with in religion. The tentative applications are intended to elucidate the scheme; in the course of them many assertions are made which obviously require much more justification than is attempted here.

We distinguish five classes of authority.

(I) The only absolute authority is the authority of God. Class I, A is the immediate authority of God, to which the proper response is worship and absolute obedience. Class I, B is the authority of God mediated through nature, to which the proper response is acknowledgment of the facts as they are, created by him who is.

(II) The reflection of this in the soul is *to phainomenon agathon,* the good as it appears to me. I have an absolute (I) obligation to obey my own (II) vision of the good, but at the same time I must not claim finality (I) for my own vision as such. I am quite likely to be mistaken.

(III) This is the authority of those who know better than I do. I recognize for myself (II) the presence of Class III authority and allow myself to be guided by it. Teachers, pastors and masters who are really what they seem have Class III authority, but successful teaching is shot through with Class II as the pupils come to see for themselves and make their own discoveries. Bad teachers must fall back on Class IV and even V.

(IV) This is the disciplinary authority of a society or its representatives over its members. Class IV, A is natural, e.g. parents over children. Class IV, B is contractual—keep the rules of the society while you belong to it; if you play the game, obey the umpire. The authority of the state has sometimes been interpreted as IV, A, and sometimes as contractual (IV, B). In practice it is often impossible to contract out, but on the second view this is merely a brute fact. Under this head every society has the authority to limit what its members may do and say while they belong to it.

(V) This is the authority of bare force imposing a slavish obedience. "You had better, or else . . ."

This scheme is hierarchical, in that each level of authority is justified by its appeal to a higher one. Force is not *mere* force when it is controlled by law. Officialdom is not *mere* officialdom if the official knows his business; unless he does know his business he is no more than a cog in the official machine. And the teacher or leader will have a *right* to teach or lead only in so far as he himself is dominated by and obedient to the good as he has seen it, and this in turn is always open to correction by the good he has not seen yet.

Outline of some Applications to Scripture and the Church

A. *The Danger and Necessity of an Absolute.*—The glory and danger of religious conviction is that it has to attribute Class I authority to the Object of its worship. As Christians we can never say simply "This is what God means to me", but "This is how God is"; never simply "This is how I feel I ought to act", but "This is the will of God".

The present temper, in philosophy and political theory, realizes the danger of the religious attitude, which begets competing fanaticisms, each claiming Class I authority for its pronouncements. Our contemporaries see no hope in opposing to the dogmatism of (Hitler or) orthodox communism an equally dogmatic and uncompromising Christianity. The crusader on any side is a menace, claiming as he does absolute authority for what is certainly relative and conditioned. The only hope of escaping disaster, say our contemporaries in the Western civilized tradition, is to recognize relativity everywhere, in ethics, politics and philosophy, and in religion too. Let each follow

what he thinks best (II). If he can persuade (III) others to agree, well and good, and when agreement is not attained agree to differ (IV), and compromise for mutual convenience. But if it is true that man is made in the image of God, he only becomes fully human when he recognizes an absolute authority. The heathen may be mistaken about what God or the gods require of him, but on this view he is more fully human in dying or risking his life in preference to breaking a tabu, than enlightened modern man to whom nothing is sacred. This conviction explains the heat generated in some recent discussions on ethics.

B. *The Authority of the Facts.*—The scientist, the scholar and the historian as such have an absolute duty (I, B) to follow the truth as it appears to them (II) wherever it may lead. No other authority can override this duty, though a proper modesty will of course take into account the opinions of the wise (III). Obedience to the facts as they are is part of everyman's obedience to God, even though it may not be recognized as such. There is in fact a general recognition among scholars of what is and what is not good work, which exercises a control over the individual, though it can never attempt to dictate to him what conclusions he should draw. In history, biography, etc., there is a control by the bare facts, but there is no hard and fast line between fact and interpretation. And so the historian takes at his peril the step from "this is what the facts appear to mean" to "this is what the facts mean", and yet he must take it, for unless he does he will have hardly any facts at all, or, which comes to the same thing, he will have so many that none is worth recording. The controlling pattern, whose authority he obeys, must commend itself to him as not merely amusing or interesting, but as true. And yet he knows it can never be certainly right, still less complete or final. And this reacts again upon what he recognizes as a fact.

C. *The Teacher and the Disciple.*—Every teacher has Class IV authority, but in so far as he is successful his pupils come to see for themselves. Is this a sufficient account of what the prophet, the apostle and the guru do? No; it is not a sufficient account even of what the creative artist (say Beethoven) does. He not merely initiates his pupils into a technique, draws their attention to certain facts and expects them to hear for themselves what he has heard. They continue to be dependent on him, and can never be as their master. They are in a true sense disciples to the end. He for them embodies the *phainomenon agathon* (II), not merely points them to it (III). In the Indian tradition the guru is recognized as god and exacts an absolute submission. No Christian can be in this sense a disciple of Luther or Francis or Augustine or any other man. Yet I may accept the authority and follow the pattern of any of these, as being for me a true representative of Christ, and I may continue to the end of my life accepting on his authority things which I never expect to be able to "see" for myself. What I do "see" (II) is that this is a holy man whose character authenticates his message, but still my seeing is under correction.

D. *The Authority of Scripture.*—Scripture in divers manners

appeals to the best in us; it convinces us that what it says about man, religion and life is an authentic transcript of experience. This applies to particular events and sayings, and also to the whole scheme of *Heilsgeschichte,* Israel-Christ-Church. As an impressive fact it can claim authority even for the humanist. The job of the lecturer, teacher and commentator is so to expound the Scripture as to let it speak for itself. He will also invite the hearer to go to school with St Paul, who certainly "knows more about it" than we do (III), and above all to recognize Jesus as "Good Master" in the highest degree.

As an extant set of writings open to empirical investigation, the books of the Bible are also under judgment. They contain the record of the divine action and word, but not every part of the record is authentic, nor all in the same sense. The words of St Paul in the authentic epistles are authentic St Paul, other epistles are authentic evidence for first-century Christianity. The *Verba Christi* in the Gospels are in varying degrees authentic utterances of Jesus mingled with authentic record of what the contemporary church believed. Only a reverent, open-minded and laborious scholarship can sort them out, and even then always "under correction" by the facts.

All this labour is part of the scholar's duty to God, and it is all carried on within the limits of a proper human modesty, claiming no more than "This is how it seems to me; do you see it like this too?"

E. *Total Surrender.*—Evangelism does more. It witnesses to a total act of faith in Christ. When I say to him not only "Good Master", but "My Lord and my God!" I am going right beyond what I can see for myself to be the truth. Flesh and blood have not revealed it, it is a supernatural gift. Evangelism can only bear witness, point in the right direction, and wait for the miracle to happen. When it has happened, any part of Scripture, even the most unlikely, can become the word of God to the believer.

The constant temptation of the Church is to try to produce or to retain believers without the miracle. This involves representing some kind of authority as having a higher grade than is really the case. "I know better—take it from me; the infallible Church says; the inerrant Scriptures say . . ."—any of these may be identified with "God says", and falsely claim the absolute authority which belongs to him alone.

For the believer the word of God has absolute authority. But since we are still human, what we understand the word to say is still conditioned by what we ourselves are capable of hearing. And so the critical comparison of what it seems to me to say (II) with what it seems to you to say is still necessary. We may find ourselves agreed in disagreeing about what each of us regards, and is bound to obey, as the authentic word of God.

F. *The Delegation of Authority.*—The varieties of grading under IV are innumerable, ranging from a system based on inherited status like feudalism, to the elaborate contractual relations of an army or commercial firm. Obedience to the state, or to established orders within the state, may be brought under obedience to God as the

author of the order of creation and of social order among men, but this does not justify attributing the authority of God to Caesar's utterances and orders, even when Caesar is a Christian. In fact, the struggles about this question are the clue to a large part of European history. It should, moreover, be clear that neither the feudal nor any other traditional pattern of graded authority can be more than an analogy of the relation between God and his creatures. In other words, God cannot *actually* be the apex of any earthly system of order. Alexander was literally king of kings, but not so God.

Explicitly delegated authority is of two main kinds. (i) The subordinate official is a plenipotentiary, authorized to commit his principal; (ii) he is bound by more or less precise instructions. Neither of these is entrusted with irrevocable authority. The nearest approach to a plenipotentiary who binds his principal whatever he does would be the Grand Vizier of a powerless monarch, or the old-style Maharajahs of Nepal. Again, a teacher instructed in a syllabus or trained in a technique, teaches at his best with the authority of his teacher, at the worst as the slave of a textbook.

None of these forms of delegated authority provides a close enough analogy to justify a claim that the Church or any of its officers as such has been given plenipotentiary authority to speak in the name of God for ever. The only perfectly authoritative delegate of God on earth is Christ himself, for he alone is perfectly obedient, and in answer to the question "By what authority?" he justifies his claim by what he does and is. It is those who sit in Moses' seat who rely on the authority of office.

G. *Ministerial Authority.*—In the unitary authority of our Lord there is no division between the authority of his office (as Christ), his authority as teacher and prophet, and his authority as the perfectly obedient Son. He speaks and acts with the authority of God, just because he is himself perfectly obedient. "I do nothing of myself, but as the Father hath taught me", and therefore "all authority is committed unto me in heaven and in earth".

And of the Holy Spirit it is said, "He shall speak nothing of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak". And the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Church, and the ministers of the Church receive the Holy Spirit for their proper office in the Church.

We have the authority of office; the bishop uses it in ordination and confirmation, the priest in absolution. But this, when it stands by itself, is a brittle thing. And therefore, if we would teach and direct with the authority of knowledge, we must continually be open at the receiving end, studying more particularly the Scriptures, as we are instructed to do at our ordination, so that the Holy Spirit in us may take of the things of Jesus and declare them to the people. At the least we shall have the authority of the Scribes, and that is not to be despised. In fact, there are times when all we can do in our preaching and teaching is to hand on faithfully what we have received.

The laity also in confirmation have received authority to make responsible judgments and to take responsible action in the name

of the Christ, by their share in the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit with which he is endowed.

And so in the life of every Christian there are times, and we cannot control them (for the Spirit bloweth where he listeth), when something supernatural takes place. In some text, some word, some prayer, some meeting with a person, in some job that has to be done, in any of a hundred different ways, the word of God takes flesh in the here and now, and it all comes alive. It is not generally in opposition to what we have received on trust; it is generally that something which we have always known at second-hand is now our own. And when we try to share that insight, or to put that general direction into practice, we are at the growing point of the living Church, which is the body of Christ. Then the Christian is most himself, when he is least doing anything of himself. Then it is not I, but Christ in me.

H. *The Authority of the Church.*—The empirical Church, the Church or Churches of history, is commissioned by God, but is distorted by sin, and also conditioned by circumstance and human limitation. Certainly it is wiser than I am, and unless I am a conceited fool I must recognize its right to teach me. Again and again what I first took on trust (III), I have found for myself to be true. "Now we believe, not for thy telling, but because we have seen." Moreover, I never expect to be anything other than dependent, living by insights which the saints have and I have never attained to. I am under Class III authority for the whole of my life. And yet something of which the Church disapproves may come to me with such a convincing sense of its rightness (II) that I am bound by holy obedience (I) to go against the Church at this point.

To the objection that this insistence on the ultimate right of private judgment leads to anarchy we may reply: (i) God speaks to men in many ways both in and outside the Church, and it is a sin to shut one's eyes or ears to any source of truth; after the series of lost rearguard actions in the fields of natural science and historical criticism, the Church knows this by now. (ii) The continuing worship of the Church does in fact correct this disbalance of each generation. In particular the Church of England has, with a few unfortunate exceptions, refrained from persecuting its extremists; in spite of this it does not wobble violently from side to side in the manner of Continental Protestant theology, but like the back wheel of a bicycle it arrives only a very little later than the front. (iii) We may acknowledge the pastoral necessity for a clear lead given to simple people, so that they do not get too much worried in the meanwhile, nor rush down every steep place into the sea. But to exalt this very necessary human prudence to the throne of God is idolatry. No one is infallible but God. When the Church makes this mistake, and claims to speak with Class I authority, I am bound ("Here stand I, I can do no other") to protest, but when it continues humble and human, and acknowledges that even its most sacred and authoritative formulas are under the judgment of God, then it authenticates itself to the affectionate and believing soul as being possessed by, though never controlling,

the power and presence of God. Precisely in not claiming infallibility or divinity or finality for itself, it witnesses to the continuing activity in and around it of the Holy Spirit, who "in the end" will lead us into all truth. It is our faith that, continuing as the Church *in via* without any security except the faithfulness of God, we shall "in that day" know even as we are known.

T. R. Milford.

Christian Giving

The first time I took a train in New York I happened to sit next to a German theologian. We got talking and I explained that I had just arrived for a year's study with the American Church. "Young man," he said, "if you want to learn anything from the Church here, make a note of all you see and write it in question form—what is this for? why don't they do this? and so on. This is the way to penetrate the American scene. You won't find all the answers but you will grasp what is going on."

The opportunity to apply this wisdom soon came my way. The following Sunday—my first in the States—I visited a downtown church in an industrial centre near New York. I knew the minister, and whilst waiting for him after the service I spoke to the treasurer and asked him the size of the collection. I got a shock. "We were about eight hundred this morning, so there will be around twenty-five hundred dollars (£900)." There was! When I mention this to folk in England it seems to encourage the illusion that all Americans are millionaires; people find it difficult to grasp that this is a workers' church in a rough industrial area. I have stayed there several times and the collections have amazed me. More vital still, I have seen the striking power of a congregation which has been trained in stewardship and which has hard cash to support its mission. This particular church has a full-time paid staff of twenty-two. Only three are clergy.

This is part of the American scene. I met it wherever I had time to see the Church in action on the ground level. They do know how to give (and why) and how to use their resources effectively. I used to say that finance was no problem to the Episcopal Church, but this is not true. It is impossible to generalize about America and my observations are limited to and by what I saw.

In a year I heard a great deal about Christian giving. The two points made most frequently were: "Giving is an act of worship" and "I expect my church to use sound business practices". Some people had visited England and many of them said: "You've got it all wrong over there. A church needs restoration, so you have a panic and an appeal. Or money is needed for a special cause, so you have a bazaar or gift day. But this is not Christian giving. When a church asks for itself, that is more like begging. You've got it wrong over there." At one Inter-Seminary Conference in the Mid-West all seven delegates at my table thought that it was only a huge government subsidy which kept the Church of England going at all.

Suggestions of this kind prompted me to try to probe the basis of the giving through which the American Church is handling such vast budgets. This seemed the most profitable approach because the motives for Christian giving should be universal, whereas American methods may not work elsewhere. During my visit the total annual receipts of the Episcopal Church—which is *not* endowed—were almost £47 million, an increase of £5 million (11·5 per cent) on the previous year. To ask how they do it is not so helpful as to ask why. This confronts us afresh with the motives of Christian giving. What is the right standard of giving to the Church? I focus here on finance, but involved is the total application of Christian stewardship, in which the American Church can teach us a great deal (and *vice versa*).

Americans believe that Christians should be trained to give regularly. After all, as the Bishop of Michigan has pointed out, when a family places God first in the budget it is a good indication that he is placed first in their lives. This is called Modern Tithing. Tithing in its simple biblical definition is the returning to God of a portion of the material wealth he has entrusted to us. The tithe is returned with a motive of gratitude, not duty, and the tither places it at the top of his personal budget. In Genesis 28. 22 Jacob said to God, "And of all that thou givest me I will give a tenth to thee", and throughout Old Testament history one-tenth was the portion set aside by religious law as God's share.

In modern times, because the Church no longer carries on many of the charitable enterprises formerly handled by the Temple, a new standard—the Modern Tithe—has been set in America. The Modern Tithe asks each Christian person or family to give 5 per cent of the net income for the Lord through the Church, in obedience to the first and great commandment; and 5 per cent to charity for the needs of others, in Christian obedience to the second and great commandment. In brief, Tithing is an open-hearted act of living gratitude. It is the result of a Christian decision to say, "Thank you, Lord", each day in a faithful way for the countless blessings which come from him. I venture to quote Bishop Emrich at length: "We don't want to play with Christianity. To-day, to some extent, we do play with it. One of the greatest teachings of the faith is gratitude. In return for what God has given us—the world, our lives, our talent—in return for his love in Christ, we are meant to give our love and offer ourselves in gratitude. The place where we do that, symbolically, is in our Church offering. It is far more than a collection for the support of the Church; it is an offering to God in money for our work, our hours, our talents, ourselves. We say, 'All things come of thee, O Lord, and of thine own have we given thee'. Now if I tip God, toss him the remaining 50c at the end of my personal budget when all comforts, luxuries, holidays, etc., have been cared for, that's not serious, nor real, nor grateful. If we want reality in worship we must set a standard that will show people that all things *do* come from God, and that they should recognize this in serious gratitude. And then when we give and our envelope is raised at the altar, it will be a real thing and add reality to our whole life with God."

It seems to me that the Diocese of Michigan is well out in front in the field of Christian giving. The whole diocese is engaged in a movement which is deeply religious, businesslike, and serious. I have seen that this is no mere committee project: it is working on the ground level. I visited more than a dozen churches around Chicago which have doubled their budgets by this means recently. It is a lay movement, with diocesan and parish groups that teach it all year long. To change the deep-seated habit of "tipping God" requires more than a fortnight's flurry; parish life goes on all the year round, so should parish teaching. The Diocese of Michigan can probably teach the Church of England a great deal about Christian giving: there will be a splendid opportunity if Bishop Emrich comes to Lambeth.

I missed the point of Modern Tithing when I heard about it for the first time. It is *not* a money-raising scheme, nor a tax. Tithing is a way of teaching, a means to bring us to God, a logical result of serious faith. The big point to emphasize is that Bishop Emrich has never once spoken about Tithing as a duty or as a way of supporting the Church. He is concerned far more with the giver than with the gift—which is as it should be. Modern Tithing teaches that the Christian life can really be lived only by those who place God first and who give him a grateful share. There is a great temptation to miss the point of Tithing. It is wrong to regard it as a slick means of raising money. The primary result of Tithing is in the changing of human lives, not in the resulting increase in parish income. The big thing to remember is that Tithing is a *spiritual practice*—an orderly method by which God's children express their gratitude to him for all of his wonderful blessings.

This is a splendid ideal. As such, it is certainly not peculiar to America. The difference between England and America is surely that in America the laity have been trained to operate this movement at the ground level and that I saw it working in parish after parish, diocese after diocese. It is not working in every American church, but it is sufficiently widespread to be a striking characteristic of the American scene. Congregations do give when they understand a program and are convinced that it is worthy and will accomplish what they believe in. This is vitally important, because people give, not as they are able, but as they understand.

This movement deserves full treatment in England. This being so, I select further points from what I saw. The combined experience of more than a hundred American parishes and missions of all sizes, shapes and varieties, over the last five years, all point to one conclusion: to teach Tithing effectively you must have a year-round Tithing Commission at parochial and diocesan levels. This establishes Tithing as a normal part of parish life and initiates new members soon after their joining. It also eliminates the possibility of Tithing being misunderstood as a "stunt" or "money-raiser". It is of the utmost importance that the principle of Modern Tithing has the official endorsement of vicar and parish council. They should set up a Tithing Commission to teach this principle, with representatives

of each functioning church organization. Especially important is the inclusion of Tithing as a regular part of Confirmation Instruction and Sunday School curriculum. Frequent use should be made of the parish magazine and other literature to carry short provocative paragraphs on Modern Tithing. There should be periodic sermons on Christian gratitude, stewardship and Tithing. Some American parishes have occasional lay-sermons on these subjects and find personal testimonies the most powerful convincer.

It takes several consecutive years of concerted effort to achieve a wide understanding and adoption of Tithing (and even then there will be some who never will). It has taken the Michigan Department of Promotion seven years to get their parishes into full stride. In a recent letter the chairman wrote: "The object was to change the orientation of our people. They had always thought and been taught to think about their duty of supporting the budget of parish, diocese and National Church. The Church has always couched its promotion in the seller's terms: 'If you do what we suggest, the Church will benefit.' Now we put it in buyer's terms. Our purpose in the first year was to get them to think only about 'How the individual grows in grace through grateful and responsible use of money' ". The Bishop's final word is: "The inner group—parochial or diocesan—must, of course, prepare a budget. *But don't go to your people with a budget* (his italics). Gratitude to God, and not the inadequate budget, should be the motive for your giving."

Many Americans were uncomfortable about old habits of giving that left them with a feeling of spiritual emptiness. Now many have made a wonderful discovery about satisfaction in Modern Tithing because it is a spiritual practice. Most new Tithers do not begin with the full 5 per cent because it is too strenuous a jump. The average new Tither begins with 2 to 3 per cent for the Church, trying to increase it from year to year "as God hath prospered him". No one can really tell a Tither how much to give: it is a decision which is made directly between the Tither and God, "from whom no secrets are hid". "What if I promise to Tithe and then find it impossible to fulfil my promise?" God understands. Modern Tithing is not a contract: it is a Christian intention. A layman recently questioned the Bishop of Chicago whether Tithing was really a Christian standard of giving. The Bishop's answer was significant: "No, Tithing is not the Christian standard of giving. The Christian standard is to give all. But we can start with the Jewish 10 per cent and work up!' It is not Tithing alone, but the complete dedication which Tithing reveals that American leaders seek for in their people.

This is part of the American scene as I saw it. I have no right to interpret it or to comment on the Church here. But I have been around on the ground level; I can record what I have seen and leave interpretation to the experience of others. I worship consistently in several churches in different parts of the country, hearing two or three sermons every week. I do not remember ever hearing one on Christian gratitude or giving. At the vast majority of services the plate or bag is shuffled round and presented at the altar during a

hymn. Is this an act of congregational *worship*? The service I remember best included a sermon which mentioned stewardship. This sent one man to sleep. A sidesman was more effective than the vicar: during the final hymn he woke the man for his collection! Recently I heard one congregation applaud itself for an increase in the number of Free-Will Offerings; probably few of them realized that one of the most popular weekly offerings was 3d. A Boston minister told me, "The real problem in England seems to be not that you have much older churches or higher taxation than we do here, but that the Church does not tackle the question, Why should I give?" I was unable to contradict him.

Sometimes people think that American giving means the Wells Scheme. This is not so; the Wells Organization for Church Fund Raising is of American origin, but it is only one of many schemes for creative fund-raising in the States. Only one American mentioned it to me during a whole year, perhaps because the American Church realizes that it can best tackle Christian giving from the inside. The Wells scheme deserves to be studied widely in England; its methods are valuable and they have been proved successful. But the fact that the Church here needs a business concern to guide it in the application of part of the faith is surely a challenge to reconsider the Church's teaching about and methods of giving.

To conclude with some words from an American layman: "All that we are, all that we have, and all that we can give comes from someone else—let us never forget that there is no such thing as a 'self-made man.' " What is the right standard of giving to the Church?

BRIAN RICE.

The Presbytera[1]

CAN there be such a thing as a vocation for the priest's wife capable of being recognized and answered as there can be for the priest himself, or for a doctor, or for a nurse? However much a girl might feel that her work must be given for the Church, she must at the same time be aware that this work might with equal probability be in nursing or in teaching, at home or abroad, or in social work, or in the religious life. Since to be a priest's wife involves the decision of another person almost more than her own, she cannot look upon it as a goal, or set herself to prepare for it. Certainly I was only aware of a compulsion to work for the Church, and any goal at all was hidden by fog as I gathered all I could in the way of likely knowledge and experience. The invitation to be a priest's wife came upon me somewhat unexpectedly, and I was less prepared to take up that work than I was to embark on any one of the other possibilities.

Looking back after twelve years I can see the preparation falling into place as in a plan, but I was at the time unaware of any vocation or of any decisive and willing response. The fact that I read theology

[1] With apologies to *The Christian East* of June 1950.

at the university and taught as a divinity specialist was not in my mind part of a planned preparation for being a priest's wife, but only the doing of what came to hand under the inner compulsion that it would lead to some work for the Church some day. This would seem to be the normal situation and so to preclude the possibility of any early organized training.

What preparation I had came during our long engagement and this, too, was so haphazard as not to merit the title "preparation". From time to time in a busy wartime teaching life I thought about the future and certain considerations emerged.

In the first place, I knew that I would be different from other wives in that my husband would not be working for my benefit or for the improvement of our home or for the advancement of our family. A priest's wife could never expect to come first in her husband's plans and thoughts. This has been borne out in practice, but only experience teaches the wife how completely she can expect to be neglected. The time-off together, the holidays together, the helping hand about the house, punctuality at meals, and the amount of housekeeping money, cannot depend on what the wife expects or would like, but upon what the ecclesiastical season of the year, the state of the parish and the needs of individual parishioners determine. Quite recently we saved up enough money to contemplate buying a refrigerator, which is considered in our parish almost a necessity in every home; the claims of the teaching side of parish work diverted this money to the purchase of a film-strip projector. Yet the only word I have ever heard expressed on this aspect of our life by any other clergywife, and that was from one much older than me, from whom I would willingly have taken advice, was: "My dear, if I had known when we were engaged that a clergyman could neglect his wife and her comfort as much as mine has, I would never have gone through with it."

Secondly, I felt sure that the stage direction "the show must go on" would apply to us. This I had learned as a girl from our own vicar and his wife. One Christmas eve their eldest boy was admitted to hospital for an urgent operation and twelve hours at least were to elapse before they could know whether recovery was possible or not. The congregation knew nothing of this, and their greetings to us after Midnight Mass and their hospitality to the lonely on Christmas Day were quite undimmed. Not till I faced a similar situation myself, however, did I realize what it cost them in effort and self-control. Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, the Patronal Festival, come on inexorably and, whatever private grief or domestic crisis may be there, it must be put to one side.

Thirdly, in some mysterious way, I knew that I must never allow myself to make a great personal friend in the parish. I expected to be isolated, but I did not expect the persistent attempts and the devious methods by which I might be tempted into too open or too close a friendship. Before six months had passed, though I thought I was sufficiently alert, one foot was over the edge of the crevasse and I only just drew back in time. A second thing I did not know was

that the work would leave so little time for private letter-writing and personal social life that I would not be able to preserve contact with my college or school friends. So I am now doubly isolated, having no close friend either in my own circle or from among my immediate neighbours. The isolation is greater than one expects.

A fourth essential seemed to be the need to offer hospitality. The caller at the vicarage should never be left just on the step; the unexpected guest should be made welcome to any meal and, if necessary, to stay the night, and as many meetings as possible should be held in the house. Experience has confirmed our belief in this. My husband knows he can, and does, bring any one to any meal. The M.U. and the P.C.C. meet in our dining-room and the confirmation class in the study. The lonely have spent Christmas day with us. Young men in the Forces have dropped in on us for forty-eight hours' leave. It produces problems in catering and laundering, but mercifully we have a fair-sized vicarage which absorbs the shock of visitors and lessens their impact on the family. What worries us is whether the present movement to build smaller and smaller vicarages is due only to financial straits or reflects the mind of the church authorities in regarding this hospitality as unnecessary. The smaller the vicarage the less it becomes possible, and in the end it becomes impossible.

I thought also that it would be right for me to accept invitations to serve on various secular bodies and committees; that this was the way for the Church to infiltrate and that thus its influence would work in the world outside. This point of view I have modified by experience and that for various reasons. Secular bodies are on the whole chary of inviting a member of the vicarage to serve on their committees. Committee work, as such, in the Church or outside, seems to accomplish less and less. But I do retain the conviction that in a sphere where one can operate by friendship, without giving too much time or energy to the organization (in my case at the moment the Women's Institute), there one has a very valuable contact with the lapsed chuch-goer and with the frankly indifferent. This is not to say that one is immediately successful, but one is preparing the way in the wilderness. For this attitude I have been rebuked by other clergy wives, who maintain that I am wasting my time going to their meetings and learning embroidery or patchwork with their members. I remain unrepentant because by so doing I hear the ordinary housewife's point of view and I can make friends with her on neutral ground, to say nothing of learning to make articles to sell at the Christmas bazaar.

I realize that my change of opinion on this point may be due to the fact that I have found myself to be a bad committee member anyway. While I am looking at my obvious shortcomings, I can say quite honestly that I am glad of my teaching experience to help me address meetings and take the Sunday school classes without too much effort, but I wish with all my heart that I could play an instrument and that I had some knowledge of First Aid. It is impossible to number the occasions when ability in these latter arts would have stood me in good stead.

So far I have tried to show what guiding principles I had in mind when I married and to what extent these principles have been justified or modified by my subsequent experience. There are, however, other aspects of the life, and the problems connected with these came upon me completely unexpectedly. I will now try to pick out the most outstanding of these.

The first of these is the depth of physical weariness that the life can produce. It is, of course, due to the leading of a double life—that of the maid of all work behind the scenes and that of the cool, unruffled mistress of the situation, in committees, in mothers' meetings, in youth clubs. Sunday night is the nadir; the experience then is one of complete emptiness of body, soul and spirit. The greater the height of the festival and the joy of communion, the deeper is the depth after evensong. With this, as with all her other minor ailments, the clergywife shares with the doctor's wife the necessity of cloaking what she feels that her husband's work be hindered as little as possible.

Linked with this is a psychological reaction, at first unnerving in its impact, from any extra solemn service or season. The frivolity that attacks the mind and the hunger that bites the body occur each time, but mercifully pass. It may in part be this type of reaction which prevents any discussion of our problems when on rare occasions clergywives meet. For a short while these problems lie behind us, our spirits soar and we are like children just let out of school, gay and uncontrolled. I do try now to damp down this frizzy reaction, having learnt on one occasion how easily it could be misinterpreted. I was travelling by bus from some meeting with another clergywife, who was facing an operation which in fact she never survived, and together we had a merry time with light-hearted, but not malicious, chatter and laughter. Unfortunately we were overheard by a lady in a very responsible position, who said later that it seemed a great pity that Fathers X and Y had such frivolous wives. I never had a chance to explain, even if I could have found the right time and the right words to do so.

The old Eve dies hard. On the one hand she is roused by words: "You're paid to do it"; "Fancy wasting time reading"; "I never trust a vicarage to owe me money". On the other hand, a pang of envy is stirred by all the material comfort so freely available. It is not so much other women's good clothes that I eye, it is their household appliances. There seems to be every possible labour-saving device in the smallest cottage, and we do not even possess an electric kettle. Once in a bitter moment I planned a devastating novel; of two friends the one entered a convent and found peace for her mind, room for her soul to expand and the opportunity to develop and exercise her undoubted gifts. The other married and found that she had embraced the threefold vow; poverty, because she had so little and none of it was fully her own; chastity, because the claims of her husband's work demanded self-control in everything; and obedience, because she had to adapt her actions to the needs of his profession and suppress her own ambitions.

That reflects more a passing, jaundiced glance on the life, but there is a more serious side. Books and travel which could do so much for us are to a large extent beyond our means, and for the wife the future seems so insecure. In my heart I would love to own just one little cottage to be a refuge if, as the world says, anything should happen. Much of the resentment of the lower-paid workers is due to this kind of fear, and how well I understand it. For them it is worse; if anything should happen, they are more often than not without an anchor of any sort, spiritual or material.

The money problem is, I suppose, the most obvious, but in many ways it is one of the easiest to deal with. Where it is felt most is where the lack of money affects any dependents. The children of the vicarage can rarely go to the parents' old schools, for the fees are practically the same as one's income. The wife often worries over penalizing them with conditions which she is prepared to accept for herself. The outside world has very little conception of the financial burden, and here the Church authorities could help by saying that the clergy receive £10 a week and not £520 a year. The world reckons its pay as a weekly wage, and a salary of £600, £550 or £520 seems a lot of money. It is only when we do a hasty sum and say to other wives what we earn a week, and then mention insurance stamps, dilapidation payments, rates, church collections (for two churches at least for most vicarage pockets), donations and hospitality expenses as regular outgoings from it, that they begin to realize the true situation.

In the matter of spiritual life and discipline I have found it better to run entirely on my own lines. Any joint effort, apart from Sunday worship, was invariably broken into by the demands of others upon one or the other of us. There was also the difference in stage of development between a trained priest and a lay person. I find it better to proceed at my own pace, under another priest's guidance. Another point in favour of this separation of effort is that everything in my life, even in public worship, is so pressed upon, often trampled upon, by people that I need a private spiritual life to draw any new fuel into myself at all.

In matters of the intellectual life, the difficulty is greater. How can the wife read enough? I know that I do not, and I am exceptionally lucky in having the basis of a theological training. What of the wife who has none and has to learn as she goes? I am convinced that theological knowledge is essential to the wife. She meets the everyday questions and those of the smallest Sunday school child or of the rawest M.U. recruit are fraught with theological problems. It is only when one has more than a nodding acquaintance with Christian doctrine that one can give an explanation simple enough to be understood and yet sound enough not to be heretical.

Other aspects of the situation come to mind, not from personal experience, but from observation of other clergy households. What are the problems where the priest has a non-Anglican wife? What will be the problems of an ordinand now engaged to a girl who, though baptized in infancy, never went to church until her engage-

ment and who still therefore has everything to learn? How will she manage to fill the gaps in her knowledge when there is all the rest to cope with? What of the priest who is married to a wife who still pursues her own profession? This latter case may offer the greatest chance of success. Her household will be run with paid, efficient help; many parishes can run their groups and clubs without the wife very well indeed; and as a companion to her husband she may well be brighter and more interesting.

It is obvious that, whatever my aims and my methods, I am largely self-taught. Perhaps someone should have caught me for advice or even training when I was engaged. For the benefit of others, and if necessary an eleventh-hour change of policy on my own part, what about a Clergy Wives Anonymous? It would be good if someone could tell us what help a priest does want from a wife, and how a more experienced woman has handled her problems, and what pitfalls still lie ahead. All I know is that week by week the miracle happens; it is not my own husband at the altar, but the ikon of Christ. Time rolls away and, with the whole company of heaven, I am there on the night in which he was betrayed. Once again he is present. Happy would I be indeed if I could dare to feel that I worked a little behind the scenes so that Christ could take the stage.

ἡ τοῦ Ἰωάννου.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. T. R. Milford is Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral.

Mr Rice is a student at the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln; he was previously at Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, on a World Council of Churches' Scholarship.

CORRESPONDENCE

CELIBACY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Principal of Cuddesdon and his critic Mr Root seem now to be agreed that the question "Are you really the sort of person who will be able to love God and a wife without failing either?" was *mal posée*; but neither they nor Mrs Grubb have laid their finger on the reason, though her helpful contribution to the discussion at least directs us where to look for it. The Christian husband's relation to his wife partakes, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, in the relation of Christ to his Church. But the ordained priest is also by his office a sharer in the relation of Christ to his Church; if this is nowhere explicitly worked out in the nuptial imagery of the writer to the Ephesians, the application of other images proper to Christ, notably that of the shepherd, to the Christian ministry should leave

us in no doubt of the New Testament view of the matter. It is this alone that distinguishes his priesthood from that corporately accorded to all who are members of Christ.

The real tension, therefore, is not between love of God and love of a wife (which would not necessarily differentiate the priest from the layman, nor marriage from other human relationships), but between love of one's own wife and family and love of the family of God entrusted to one's care. The prevailing tendency of husbands to accept a larger share of domestic and parental chores than formerly, however admirable in itself, cannot but intensify the conflict. There are many priests who are conspicuously successful in setting their marriage within the larger relationship of the priest to his flock, and in parcelling out their time accordingly. There are others to whom this is not given, and those moreover of two contrary kinds; there have been priests whose pastoral zeal left them no time to spare for their families, and priests whose ministry failed to fulfil its early promise because they became uxorious. Plainly, if a man is at all predisposed to either of these matrimonial pitfalls, it is vital that he should face the fact before he has committed himself; and if, as I believe, this is what the Principal of Cuddesdon was really insisting on, he has been less than fairly used by his critics.

Yours truly,

HUMPHREY GREEN.

KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

As I read the article with the subsequent correspondence on Celibacy in the last three issues of THEOLOGY, I cannot help noticing the absence, in such ex-cathedra pronouncements from the compline chair, of a clear indication of the forces at work within the situation, in which an ordinand has to "choose" between marriage and celibacy, as well as the forces which the Church imposes from without.

Thinking in terms of choice between these two states seems to be based on that false pattern of priorities by which we talk of vocations to this, that and the other. No one has to choose between marriage or celibacy, between this vocation and that. We all have one vocation to *life*. It is in the course of our wilful co-operation with God that we have to assess that state or circumstances to which God has predisposed us, as the next development, or the circumstances making for the development, of our vocation.

Our knowledge of human nature, fallen and being redeemed, compels us to believe that one of the most powerful forces at work within the ordinand's marriage-celibacy situation is his God-given psychological and physiological disposition. Most ordinands will find themselves thus predisposed to marriage, likewise a corresponding number of potential priests' wives; and such couples will become aware of their claim on each other as potential man and wife, only

after this claim has been made by one or both of them. The ordinand and his potential wife, like all praying Christians, are bound to leave the timing of this event to God the Holy Spirit at work within the lives and circumstances of the couple concerned.

It is unlikely that the ordinand will consider marriage until God has thus drawn him towards that partner who, with him and the majority of men, is predisposed to marriage and family life, as the setting or state in which they shall both move towards that wholeness of personality, which is their vocation.

If we may regard the state of bachelordom as a neutral and agnostic condition, it follows that Celibacy remains as the positive development of the vocation of those who, through the condition of their mind or body, are ineligible for the state of marriage, as it should be expressed according to the teaching of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer.

This does not mean that the celibate is always he who is in some way odd or defective. He can only be the man who, for reasons of which he at least is convinced, cannot move towards that wholeness of personality, which movement is a condition of a useful ministry, through the one-flesh relationship of marriage and family life.

He will indeed be a rarity, and the man who prayerfully loiters in the agnosticism of bachelordom should not be led to confuse himself with this celibate. Ordinands, together with those who will be their wives, need much more instruction in the mechanics of assessing the will of God to which he is always predisposing them through the total circumstances of their lives, than they receive on the alleged need for celibate priests.

As for the plea that there is so much learning and work to be done by a bachelor or celibate priesthood; this plea even in these days of comfortable curates, does less than justice to the ability of young families to live an ascetic twenty-five hours a day.

Yours faithfully,
BRIAN J. C. TAYLOR.

26 BEAUFORT ROAD,
ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE,
MANCHESTER.
12 *July* 1957.

ECUMENICAL UNBELIEVERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

A caveat should perhaps be entered against the appropriation of the appellation "humanist" by agnostics because the prestige which adheres to that name was largely contributed by men like Erasmus and More who never abandoned the catholic faith; and a very good definition of a true humanist is one who believes that the study of man is the best approach to the knowledge and love of God. By contrast, the factor common to the bodies calling themselves humanist to-day is a denial of the supernatural.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize, as Mr Gray does in your June issue, that these bodies are concerned with concepts of truth and goodness derived from Christianity and that God may be at work among them. The element of denial was motivated by an ardent ethical sense which was outraged by the support given to tyranny and social injustice by organized religion and by a love of truth which was offended by the obscurantist attitude of the bishops towards scientific discovery and speculation. Even a man so extreme as Charles Bradlaugh was inspired by values which were essentially Christian in origin and which are rarely found in a dynamic form in parts of the world not deeply influenced by "the children of the Book", as Mohammedans call Jews, Christians and themselves.

The position taken up by the movement surveyed by Mr Gray is really the *n*th term of a process, operating during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries among many men of goodwill, which was a mistaken method of meeting the demands of scientists and social reformers. More and more of the supernatural teaching of Christianity was discarded until in the end the theological cat entirely disappeared except for its ethical smile. The smile, however, is essentially Christian, and the movement should be regarded as a Christian heresy rather than as one of the modern anti-Christian versions of the religions of pride and power.

It may be hoped that Mr Gray's generous and tolerant approach to this question may promote understanding and even co-operation between all (however deficient the theology of some may be) who stand for Christian values against the forces of indifference and hostility.

Yours faithfully,

ALEC CRAIG.

5 AVENUE HOUSE,
BELSIZE PARK GARDENS,
LONDON, N.W.3.

BOOK REVIEWS

L'ABBÉ PAUL COUTURIER, Apôtre de l'Unité Chrétienne (Souvenirs et Documents). By Maurice Villain. Collection *Eglise Vivante.* Casterman. N.p.

Here we have the long-awaited life of Abbé Paul Couturier. The Abbé—for so he was styled *tout court* by the "separated brethren" in many a land—was recognized and honoured everywhere as the pioneer of *Spiritual Oecumenism.* The book is a labour of love by a gifted and distinguished priest, a Marist father, the Abbé's most intimate disciple and friend and helper for the last seventeen years of his life. It must have proved indeed a difficult task because of the largeness, the complexity and the delicacy of the theme. And the book is a truly worthy achievement—challenging, sober, authoritative, enkindling, thorough and withal exceedingly readable. Here is Abbé Couturier as his friends have known and loved him: a priest catholic in the fullest sense of the words, as transparently disinterested in his love towards ourselves as he was intransigent in his faithfulness to his own Church; a man of a vigour, industry and courage

scarcely credible in one so frail; a soul of flaming devotion and great gentleness, equipped with unguessed width of knowledge and with hidden springs of awareness and of sympathy all combined with surprising shrewdness and great practical realism. Many will find their idea of the Abbé by this book greatly enriched and enlarged. We are shown the thoroughness and farsightedness of his endeavour and the width of his horizons. We are enabled to glimpse clearly something of the poignant cost of his oblation and to trace his own special approach to the heavenly springs from which were derived his prayerful and efficacious wisdom.

The book is of the first importance for the study of Oecumenism and most worthy of its place in the great collection *Eglise Vivante*. Of unique value amongst many documents of signal interest to be found here are selections and extracts from the letters and writings of Abbé Couturier himself, whose last statement of his convictions and hopes—Prière et Unité Chrétienne—is given in full in an appendix.

It was not until his fifty-second year that Abbé Paul Couturier found his unique vocation. He discovered it in 1932 in Belgium, in the Priory of the Monks of Union (until 1953, when they moved to Chevetogne, still domiciled at Amay). Of this community he became in the following year an oblate. A young Dominican priest, now widely known and deeply reverenced by reason of his indispensable labours in the same field of work for unity, Père Congar, O.P., was also at Amay in those days responding to a similar call from God. A Dominic and a Francis in our days also both need and profit from the fatherly help of the sons of St Benedict. The community of the Monks of Unity had been founded in the year of Cardinal Mercier's death, 1926, and in some sense owes its existence to that great Christian leader. Abbé Couturier himself, in his charity, his humility, his prayerfulness, seems to me to be best understood in the light of three singular sayings of the Cardinal-Archbishop rather than through the influence of any hero of the religious life. First, "In order to unite with one another, we must love one another. In order to love one another, we must know one another. In order to know one another, we must meet one another." This was the source of his intrepid and zealous apostolic charity. Second, "Reality in God dwelling within you." Here lay the secret of the Abbé's humility—he had the cardinal's faith in God as dwelling within the sanctuary of every baptized soul. Third, "Holiness is taking God at his word." Abbé Couturier's unique sense of the power of prayer has this simple Gospel conviction as its spring. The fulfilment of these principles led him to great depths of penitence as well as of self-sacrifice. It is surely the lack of this note of penitence with regard to disunity, a note sounded so splendidly by great catholic leaders of the past, e.g. in England by Cardinal Pole, which makes present-day catholicism so dark a chapter.

An instrument ready for use in the Abbé's great work for unity was the Octave of Prayer for this end, observed annually between 18 January (in the Roman Calendar feast of St Peter at Rome) and

25 January (feast of the Conversion of St Paul), a commemoration instituted by Father Spencer Jones (Anglican), and Father Paul Watson (who later became Roman Catholic). It was Abbé Couturier who had the insight as to how the observance of this week might become welcome everywhere. What was necessary was to express its intention, that is to say the intention of Christ, in a form to which every Christian in whatever religious tradition or stage of development could subscribe; thus enabling all to join at one and the same time in prayer "that God will give the visible unity of his kingdom such as Christ wishes, when he wishes and through whatever means he wishes". The Octave of Prayer, which by reason of its propaganda had been by Protestants eschewed (understandably if not altogether fairly) as Roman Catholic proselytism, was thus rebaptized to become the Week of the Universal Prayer of Christians for Christian Unity.

"This formula and this intention," wrote the Reverend Professor L. Richard, P.S.S., of the University of Lyon, "are accepted by Catholics without reserve. Without doubt they believe that this unity —in its essential elements—is already given and preserved inviolably by the Christ himself in his visible Church of which the universal pastorate is entrusted to Peter and to his successors." But they also know—and here Anglicans and Eastern Orthodox are with them in penitence—that this unity is wounded, that its radiation is obscured by separations for which Christians carry the responsibility, that the Christ who has prayed that all may be one, is the only true author of the unity of his disciples" (*Semaine Religieuse du diocèse de Lyon,* 25 September 1953).

This development and extension of the Week of Prayer was not simply the work of an acute psychologist. It was the work also of an experienced man of prayer who had pondered deeply upon its laws; who had observed that the power of prayer will be intensified in proportion to the simplicity of the soul's surrender, of its abandonment in union with the mind of Christ. Our Lord's prayer of self-consecration "that they all may be one as we are . . . that the world may know that thou hast sent me" is one with which every Christian can and must unite himself. Yet no prayer glows with greater ardour; no other gives us so keen a glimpse into the hidden sanctuary of his heart. There is thus found in the Gospel itself a bond of sovereign authority and efficacy, for the unification, without the least sacrifice of principle, of the prayer of all Christians. The realization of this has struck Christians everywhere with the divine power of prophetic illumination. In particular a Catholic rejoices finding that the Universal Prayer for Christian unity has thus mobilized an immense volume of powerful because simple, disinterested and Christ-minded prayer for the realization of the unity willed by Christ and therefore sought continually by his Church. In proportion to the integrity of his catholic certainty he will be sure that this worldwide prayer must lead to the extension of the sway of the one catholic and apostolic church. In proportion to the single-mindedness of his devotion to the Lord Christ he will be glad if any fibre of what is commonly regarded

as Catholic tradition (a congeries never exactly measurable in extent) which does not stand firm before this wind of the Spirit, shall be purified or swept away. Unless we are almost unimaginably hard-boiled in ecclesiastical complacency and pride, we must admit that there may be in the unity for which Christ died some factor as yet unguessed by ourselves. In view of the phenomenally rapid transfiguration of catholicism operative before our eyes after ages of congelation, it would be surely rash to claim that there had been yet achieved in doctrine, liturgy or hierarchic order a final formulation, perfect in detail and in proportion, of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

"Humility opens every door." These are the words the Abbé took as a motto for his tract for the last Week of Prayer for Unity. They were found, surmounted by an artist's design expressive of their truth, pinned on a wall close to the bed on which he died on the eve of the feast of the Annunciation, 1953. Certainly he had proved in life their truth. How wonderfully he enabled us to see the light of Christ shining through the countenance of the Roman Church, a visage shown as profoundly loving despite its apparent hardness and rigid petrifaction! This book will help us all better to understand the power of *Spiritual Emulation* which through the influence of the Abbé has replaced in so many Christians the fear, jealousy and suspicion so long prevalent in souls in which should have prevailed our Lord's own eucharistic prayer that all may be one.

May Père Villain's book have the widest possible influence in our land and win for itself translator and publisher who will do their best to give its racy style and the singularly French character of its structure the right English equivalent. No necessary inadequacy in the performance of that perhaps almost impossible task would serve to hide the radiance of the figure here described or to observe the truth that Abbé Paul Irénée Couturier embodies a word of God in our generation to all Christians, but especially to all those who aspire to be worthy of the name Catholic.

Mirfield. Geoffrey Curtis, C.R.

Essays in Liberality. By Alec R. Vidler. S.C.M. Press. 15s.
Christian Belief and This World. By Alec R. Vidler. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Christians will widely rejoice that Dr Vidler, illuminated by the Gladstonian wisdom of Hawarden and the cooing of doves in Windsor, now once more walks the courts of Cambridge as Dean of King's. In these two volumes—the one the Firth Lectures delivered in the University of Nottingham, the other essays and lectures delivered on various occasions or reprinted from journals—he returns repeatedly to the same theme which is at once ethical and theological

—the obligation of the Christian as he lives in the world and affects it by his character and vocation and is affected by it.

The admirable essay on "Holy Worldliness" carries on the argument "Should Christians be Nonconformists?" Both are telling answers to the charge which Professor Wilder says is made against the Christian religion to-day that it is "other-worldly, escapist and irrelevant to the problems of this life". One could not wish for anything more salutary than that a young man setting forth on life should read what Dr Vidler advises "Z to do". In one volume he summons the Lord's people to be once more prophets and in the other looks at the biblical view of history, for there can be no prophecy without a true philosophy of history.

A theologian to-day is hard put to it to justify his existence and the flight from reason is a sinister feature of our times. H. J. Paton in his fine Gifford Lectures refers to the difficulties in formulating any philosophy of religion in these days, faced as we are with a veto from the right and a veto from the left. On the one hand the exponents of linguistic analysis insist that theological statements being incapable of verification are therefore nonsense, while on the other the followers of Barth denounce philosophical theology as a sin, if not a crime. In such a situation it is indeed brave of Dr Vidler to come out as a knight in shining armour in defence of liberality. To call a man liberal to-day is in politics to associate him with a lost cause and in theology to use a dirty word. Dr Vidler shows very clearly why the pendulum has swung against liberalism, but magnificently reinstates the virtues of liberality as being not the opposite of conservative or orthodox so much as being the opposite of fanatical, bigoted or intransigent. Dr Vidler is of course thinking of a liberal with a small "l" and on every page vindicates the liberal point of view. It does not involve the abandonment of the faith that has been handed down to us, but it does involve its generous involvement in the needs and perplexities of the time: it demands that the Church relate itself to the world not by sacrificing itself on the altar of "modern thought" or by retreating into a world of irrelevant technicalities or archaism but by a catholic concern with the whole of life as under the judgment and mercy of God. Theology must cease to be the monopoly of the clergyman; it must come out into the streets to give light to man in the problems and decisions of the work-a-day world. Dr Vidler believes that a revival of theology will be a lay movement: it will have to capture lay interest and gain intellectual respect but, if it wishes to do so, it will have to abandon the arrogance and tendency to bring all reasoning under condemnation in the name of the Fall which Paton calls "theological Positivism".

Dr Vidler finds an element of liberality in Anglicanism, and the essays on "Bishop Gore and Liberal Catholicism" and "What is Anglicanism?" are particularly interesting in this respect. It is worth speculating whether the mantle of traditional Anglicanism may not have fallen upon the new and younger churches as they press towards a united church. One thing is certain. The Christian apologist

can no longer take anything for granted. He has to come down from a pedestal, advance from a retreat and stand where Dr Vidler so lovingly but confidently stands "on the frontier", and there he might well take as handbook the essay on "Frontier Methods and Maxims".

Both these books are written in a lively and clear manner, and it is delightful to read a theologian who still knows how to write decent prose and avoid jargon and who has both wit and a capacity for wide and sometimes unexpected quotation.

Here are two books for the frontiersman and even perhaps for the outsider. May they be widely read and still more widely discussed.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

ESSAYS ON TYPOLOGY. By G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This must be regarded as a stimulating rather than as a permanently valuable book It consists of two essays, one on "The Reasonableness of Typology" by Professor Lampe, and one on "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology" by Mr Woollcombe. As one might expect from a work consisting of two essays, it raises more questions than it succeeds in answering.

Professor Lampe's essay is an able piece of work which makes out a respectable case for accepting typology as a valid way of interpreting the significance of Jesus. He defines typology as that which "seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine activity" (p. 29). It is, however, disconcerting to find him, immediately after defining typology in this way, defending the story of Jonah as a genuine type of Christ's resurrection (pp. 29–30). In what sense could we possibly describe Jonah's adventures as an historical event?

Mr Woollcombe's essay is a more ambitious affair, and, venturing more, he falls further from his target. Professor Lampe, though he had suggested (reasonably enough) that our Lord himself must have given the initiative in the search for Christological types in the Old Testament (pp. 24–25), had paid very little attention to the existence of pre-Christian typology. Mr Woollcombe boldly denies its existence altogether and takes Professor T. W. Manson to task for suggesting that typology had already been practised in Judaism (p. 42). For this bleak denial Mr Woollcombe offers no evidence whatever. In fact, there is a respectable body of evidence in favour of Professor Manson's assertion, none of it mentioned in either of these essays. There are examples of allegory and typology to be found in the *Habakkuk Commentary* and the *Zadokite Document*, and the list of Messianic proof-texts (some of which might well be described as typology) found at Qumran (see the closing pages of Gaster's *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*). There is the list of "recapitulative" types given in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Vol. I, pp. 85–88. A list of pre-Christian Jewish types can be recovered from certain early Christian sources, such as funerary monuments (see D. Kaufman, "Sens et origine des symboles tumulaires de l'Ancient Testament

dans l'art chrétien primitif", *Revue des Études Juives*, Tom. XIV, pp. 33–48 and 217–253 (1887)), and from the Clementine Liturgy in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Evidence like this cannot be dismissed in a sentence. Again, Mr Woollcombe does not seem to realize (or does not give the impression of realizing) that Rabbinic allegorization of the Song of Solomon (every example of which comes from a period after most of the New Testament was written) is neither the earliest nor the only example of Palestinian Jewish allegorizing. There is good evidence for its existence outside the pages of Strack-Billerbeck (who are rather coy and restrained upon this point). Further, it seems to me unlikely that developed Christian allegory owes anything significant to Gnostic allegory (as Professor Lampe suggests on p. 32), and wholly improbable that, as Mr Woollcombe asserts, giving as his only evidence one doubtful instance from *II Clement*, in the sub-apostolic age traditional Christian typology "was at once obscured and overlaid by the symbolic typology of Hellenistic Platonism" (p. 69). Until Theophilus, allegory of the Bible in sub-apostolic literature (with the exception of a few passages in the *Epistle of Barnabas*) stems from the native Palestinian pre-Christian tradition of allegory, and owes nothing to Alexandria.

Mr Woollcombe's essay has some valuable points. On Philo he is illuminating and convincing and in particular gives us a useful discussion of *typos* in that author (pp. 60–3). His account of Hellenistic allegory is sound (pp. 50–2), though it is strange that he omits any mention of the only pagan author whose allegories of Homer have come down to us in any abundance, Heracleitus, who wrote the *Quaestiones Homericae*. And he gives interesting information about the rejection of non-historical allegory in Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom (p. 56).

Still, the effect of this book is unsatisfying. Perhaps it was not intended to be otherwise. What exactly is the test of bad typology? Has not historical criticism taught us that even typology must show some connexion between the meaning when first uttered or written of the original passage in the Old Testament on the one hand and on the other the Christological meaning borne by the type? Can typology ever be more than event corresponding to event and not person to person or object to object? In the Old Testament, history is peculiarly the field of God's revelation of himself; does not any typology, except one strictly of event corresponding to event, tend to destroy or impair this truth? Above all, are not we to-day, in as far as we accept typology, accepting it from motives quite different from those which induced the ancient writers to accept it? They saw in typology a witness to God's wonderful activity in causing both extraordinary prediction and extraordinary fulfilment; we see it simply as witnessing to God's character, as showing the pattern of his activity, without taking very seriously either prediction or fulfilment. We may thank the authors of this book for raising these questions. We cannot thank them for providing answers to them.

R. P. C. Hanson.

University of Nottingham.

THE TRAGIC PHILOSOPHER. A Study of Friedrich Nietzsche. By F. A. Lea. Methuen, 30s.

This book ought to be compulsory reading in all theological colleges and for all those who have discovered (or should have discovered) that the difficulties of preaching in the twentieth century are not just "problems of communication". Nietzsche's importance cannot easily be exaggerated. He was the first—and up till now the last—to articulate brilliantly, ruthlessly and often inescapably, the ultimate scepticism, nihilism and unbelief of man's heart—be that heart pagan or Christian. His psychological insight, more penetrating and much more disturbing than Freud's, has made all systems of morals and especially all systems of moral theology very questionable. His understanding of the *radical* ambiguities of language prevented and outpaced the concerns of the Logical Positivists. It certainly demythologized the demythologizers—and it could, long since, have freed the theologian for his real task of rethinking, as radically, the relationship between "The Word" and the welter of our desperately ambiguous words. (A fruitful hint to those engaged in interdenominational discussions?) Before N.'s inexorable logic, all metaphysical speculation, all apologetics, natural theology and religion look irrelevant, trivial and a little insincere. All this Mr Lea has worked out very well. He quotes copiously and intelligently. For that alone we owe him much.

Nietzsche's passion for intellectual honesty drove him into absolute scepticism, to the point of "no return", the point where we all should arrive if we were as honest and intelligent as he. But man cannot live on the edge of nothing. After rope-dancing for a time over the abyss and pretending that this is man's greatest joy, N. returns and from a destroyer of idols changes, inevitably, like all men, into a creator of idols. This, too, is of supreme significance for all theologians: that man cannot live without religion and that religion is seen as the making of gods in man's image. (In the light of N.'s teaching it does not matter whether the gods are called "superman", "eternal recurrence" or "Jesus Christ", "the Kingdom of Heaven".) The culmination of N.'s thought is full of irony and unbearable pathos. Having almost forgotten the origin of his idols in his enthusiasm of creation, he stumbles, almost accidentally, on the now unexpected discovery that his god was—he himself. But I do not think it was an accident that this moment of final insight coincided with the beginning of his madness. This aspect of N.'s life and thought Mr Lea does not seem to appreciate fully. His final attempt to harmonize N.'s teaching with that of Jesus and Paul simply shows that he shares with N. and many theologians the mistaken belief that Christianity is a religion—for N. was undoubtedly a religious man. From N.'s position—from man's situation—nothing leads to grace, not even the "leap of faith". But if—in spite of all and from behind all doubts and despair—*that* faith has touched us which is beyond our critique, because it is precisely that which radically criticizes us, then we may, perhaps, say: Nietzsche was by grace kept

graceless that we might understand, it is only by grace that we may believe.

The rendering of the many quotations is adequate, although it never quite catches the crispness of the original German which is inimitable. But to translate "Zarathustra", which even in German suffers from some Swinburnian lusciousness, into the English of the A. V. makes it sound unnecessarily stuffy and stilted.

W. Pelz.

Lostock Vicarage,
Bolton.

Freud and Religious Belief. By H. L. Philp. Rockliff. 18s.
Christian Essays in Psychiatry. Edited by Philip Mairet. S.C.M. Press. 15s.
Adjustment through Faith. By Erastus Evans. Spiritual Healing Booklets, No. 6. 1s.
The Biology of the Spirit. By Edmund W. Sinnott. Gollancz. 16s.

It is to be hoped that no further books will be published which discuss the relation of the views of Freud, Jung and Adler to religious problems and theological issues. This is not to say that the study of the psychology of religion is not a worthwhile task, but that it should be based upon facts and theories capable of standing up to scientific scrutiny rather than on the application of scholarship to the speculations of clinicians. An exception to this stricture must be made, however, for Dr Philp's book, which instead of aiming at drawing somewhat dubious parallels between religious and clinical phenomena, makes a scholarly and critical examination of Freud's religious views. The first chapter is especially significant, applying to Freud his own method of seeking an explanation of adult personality in the experiences of early childhood. Dr Philp traces from Freud's biography a series of human situations which understandably led him to become, as he put it, an "unrepentant atheist". Some explanation was clearly necessary for Freud's attitude to religion, as it went ill with other sides of his character and produced a series of statements upon religion, the arguments of which show less than the acumen displayed in his other works. The later chapters of Dr Philp's book take Freud's statements one by one and examine them on both religious and scientific grounds. These chapters might have been more effective for a lay audience if they had assumed less knowledge of Freud's works and if they had concentrated their attack more upon the scientific foundations of his theories than upon their theological implications. Dr Philp does perhaps both less and more than justice to Freud—less in that Freud's shrewd observations on the nature and purposes of some people's religion have not always been given the credit they deserve; more than justice in that some of Freud's ideas are so patently absurd that they do not merit Dr Philp's forbearance. The book is, however, thorough and valuable

and deserves to mark the turning point towards a new approach to the relationship between religion and the psychology of personality.

Some of the contributions to *Christian Essays in Psychiatry* show signs that such a change is beginning. While some are from a frankly psycho-analytical point of view, others show vigorously the empirical approach that marked the work by authors such as E. D. Starbuck in his book *The Psychology of Religion* around the turn of the century. The essays vary widely in their presuppositions and it is likely that different readers will approve of different contributions. The present reviewer found most of the essays stimulating but feels that special mention should be made of those on Religious Development by Dr Storr and Mrs Lewis, and of the interesting statement made by Dr Russell upon the attitude of a psychiatrist to moral problems.

Some of the essays illustrate clearly the contrast between two very different types of approach to the psychology of religion. One approach is to start by assuming the accuracy of religious doctrines and then to seek evidence to illustrate, support and amplify these from the facts and theories of psychology and psychiatry. The other approach consists in examining the clinical or other data and using these in an attempt to assess the soundness of religious beliefs. It is doubtful whether either of these methods is entirely satisfactory, but from the scientific point of view it is the second rather than the first which should be followed, and it is certainly this which is the more likely to compel the attention of a scientifically educated layman.

The pamphlet *Adjustment through Faith* is disappointing. It aims at finding a link between psychotherapy and religion which will satisfy the "modern religious mind", in order that psychotherapists and ministers can understand each other. The author expounds the view that this link can be found in *faith*. Unfortunately, the language is too technical for the pamphlet to be of use to a layman and the construction appears too loose for it to be of much value to a specialist in either field.

Undoubtedly the boldest of the four works here being reviewed is Dr Sinnott's *The Biology of the Spirit*. The author sets out the thesis that all biological organisms show tendencies to develop towards an organized pattern and to maintain this pattern when it has once been reached. The whole system thus appears to behave teleologically—to be "drawn" towards "goals". In using these terms Dr Sinnott is careful to explain that he does not mean the teleology condemned as an explanatory principle by psychologists during the past few decades, but is looking upon the biological organism as an elaborate self-regulatory mechanism. He suggests that what we call the mind can be regarded as an aspect of this goal-seeking organization which is inherent in all biological systems. He thus seeks to dispense with dualism of mind and body by seeing both as aspects of the unity of life. He specifically disclaims originality for his views but has undoubtedly worked out the ideas he expounds in challenging detail, neatly avoiding a number of biological pitfalls which loom up at intervals. Dr Sinnott does not seem to get round the problem that the type of system he suggests is a fundamentally deter-

ministic one with no real place for freedom of will. This, however, is really a rather trivial criticism at this stage. Here would seem to be a stimulating book, eminently suitable for putting into the hands of a critical student and written in the best scientific tradition of setting out a view as clearly and consistently as possible, while recognizing that its statement is incomplete and that much more will need to be done before final answers can be reached. This book may not compel agreement but it should certainly engender respect and be provocative of thought.

A. T. Welford.

The Psychological Laboratory,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

Pilgrim's Programme. By William Purcell. Collins. 10s. 6d.

A Two-Way Religion. By V. A. Demant. Mowbray. 5s.

Members of Christ. By Joost de Blank. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

The Meaning of Christian Perfection. By Jordan Aumann, O.P., and D. L. Greenstock. Blackfriars. 12s. 6d.

St Aelred's Letter to his Sister. Mowbray. 5s.

Meditations to the Holy Spirit. By an Augustinian. Mowbray. 4s.

"Sir, we would see Jesus." By P. M. Barry. Mowbray. 4s.

The Light of the World. By Father Andrew. Mowbray. 4s.

Confession. By J. C. Heenan. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

Retreat to Advance. By Mark Carpenter-Garnier. Mowbray. 5s.

God of God, Light of Light. By G. E. Hoffman. St Andrew's Church, Paris, Illinois. $1.00.

The accepted difficulty for writers of pastoral theology is to find the right emphasis upon, and relation between, both words. It is not easy to write simply about Christian practice without departing from the eternal truths of Christian doctrine, nor to state theological facts in a way which has real meaning for the layman's everyday life. By this criterion, by far the most successful of the books now under review is *Pilgrim's Programme* by William Purcell. The serious inquirer—for whom the book is written—is here introduced to the basic reasons *and* requirements for *living* the Christian life of prayer and service; not merely of knowing about it. There is no attempt to minimize the searching demands our Lord makes upon his disciples, yet this author faces the fact of our finite humanity and weakness: this is true pastoral theology.

The book is based on the "seven rules for Church membership" issued by the archbishops some years ago, and my one query—a query rather than a positive criticism—is to ask whether such a general pastoral directive, however good in itself, is the right framework for a work of this kind? I cannot resist the suggestion that, had the

author chosen some more solid ascetical foundation, one of the classical systems, or the Book of Common Prayer for example, then he would have produced more of an integrated program, or "Rule", and less of a series of essays. And such is clearly his intention. The substance of the book remains of quite exceptional value.

Dr Demant's *A Two-Way Religion* equally fulfils the necessary pastoral-theological qualification, but in rather a different way. Here is a more general explanation of what the Christian life really is because Christian dogma is what *it* is: how vital and how practical! Especially valuable to the modern layman is this writer's explanation of the relation between ontology and psychology (or fact and feeling) and his subsequent discussion of the perennial yet neglected problems of aridity in prayer.

Members of Christ, by the new Archbishop of Cape Town, is the reproduction of a series of addresses. The book insists, rightly, on the essential relation between the Christian life and the evangelistic nature of the Church. But precisely how, in practice, does this fact find expression? We are not told very clearly, which seems to be the weak point in the current "direct" evangelistic approach. I am inclined to suspect that the original lectures, with discussion, were more exciting than the book.

The Meaning of Christian Perfection is an argument by correspondence between Fr Jordan Aumann, O.P., and Fr David Greenstock. Here we find all the delicate distinctions and intricate subtleties of modern Thomism applied to the pastoral implications of Perfection, and the individual's progress towards it. Anglicans, while appreciating the merit of two such trained and disciplined minds, will be divided about the book's practical value. Some will find it rather dull and "academic". Others will be made uncomfortably aware of our own somewhat vague and haphazard approach to spiritual direction and pastoral ascetics. Irresistibly forced to the latter position, I found the book stimulating and useful.

"Devotional" reading for the faithful is supplied by new translations of St Aelred's *Letter to his Sister* and the anonymous fourteenth-century *Meditations to the Holy Spirit.* Those responsible for the *Fleur de Lys* series are to be congratulated on continuing to make the lesser-known classics of the spiritual life so attractively and inexpensively available.

From ancient to modern: *Sir, we would see Jesus* by P. M. Barry, has the virtue of introducing us to the Person of Christ before considering his words and works: the prime purpose of meditative prayer so often forgotten. *The Light of the World* is yet another posthumous selection from Fr Andrew, S.D.C., which will appeal to his many devotees; and if there are any serious Anglicans still unacquainted with Fr Andrew's particular gift, this is as good a selection as any to begin with.

Meditations are notoriously difficult to review, their appeal depends so much on the unique spirituality of each individual reader; so, having tasted these four little books, I can only suggest very tentatively that "the old is better".

Yet another little book on *Confession* has appeared. This time by Dr Heenan, the new Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool. It differs from most in that it very frankly, and thus very pastorally, looks at the Sacrament of Penance from both penitent's and confessor's point of view. By so doing it tells the first penitent, or would-be penitent, precisely what he really wants to know and so often fails to find.

Bishop Carpenter-Garnier's *Retreat to Advance* is of double value in that it is not only an excellent retreat in itself, but it also teaches the overall technique of private retreat. Any conscientiously making this retreat will find themselves capable of making their own private retreats later.

Lastly, George Edward Hoffman has produced a sonnet sequence on the Nicene Creed which he calls *God of God, Light of Light*. Without feeling qualified to judge the quality of the verse, I retain the impression that it is good and healthy that such a thing should have been done.

MARTIN THORNTON, O.G.S.

THE ARCHBISHOP AND THE LADY. The Story of Fénelon and Madame Guyon. By Michael de la Bedoyere. Collins. 16s.

FÉNELON'S LETTERS TO MEN AND WOMEN. Selected with an introduction by Derek Stanford. Peter Owen. 21s.

Count Michael's book is largely devoted to an apology for Madame Guyon, and he presents her as a much persecuted and misunderstood woman "in an age when individual consciences counted for little". How far he succeeds is probably best left to the judgment of his readers. However much may be said for her, and she was an extraordinary woman, it must be confessed that she constituted a real nuisance to Ecclesiastical Authority. Whatever may be said to the detriment of Bossuet, the record of her visions and ecstatic extravagances which he was compelled to examine can have been anything but pleasant reading to a theologian and historian of his calibre and outlook.

It seemed plain to him that the basic experience which lies behind the Quietist type of religion demands for itself the immediate criterion of religious certitude. From it arose a claim to dictatorship in the spiritual sphere in marked contrast to the then prevailing order in Church and State based as it was upon a form of Absolutism equally dominating. The Quietist and Pietist Movements were examples of the attempt to base religious certitude upon experience to the exclusion of reason. In this connexion, therefore, Bossuet instinctively smelt Revolution. Revolution in Church and State. He felt the ground tremble beneath his feet. From the standpoint of the old order the issue at stake was a vital one. Fénelon managed to transfer his allegiance to an external and objective authority in the Papacy.

The Papacy had no more devoted servant than the Archbishop of Cambrai and, had the political consequences for the Grand Monarch and Pope Innocent been other than they were, Fénelon might have escaped censure. In Fénelon we have the first signs of the on-coming storm. In his deep-laid political and educational schemes a new order is foreshadowed. If Bossuet cuts a very poor figure in contrast to Fénelon, with whom the greater sympathy and liking will probably always remain, it will not do just to write him off as bourgeois, though it is probable that the aristocrat in Fénelon resented the attitude adopted by Bossuet towards a lady. Count Michael has written an interesting book though the theme is a well-worn one. It is to be wished, however, that here and there he had avoided certain colloquialisms which grate on the reader.

Mr Derek Stanford's edition of *Fénelon's Letters to Men and Women* is not only welcome, since they have been long out of print, but is provided with an excellent introduction which traces briefly the main events of his life. So far as personalities are concerned he refers to Abbé Bremond and Count Michael de la Bedoyere's opinion that the cause of all the trouble lay with Madame de Maintenon, who played upon Bossuet's fears. Nevertheless the issue at stake, and one which Monsignor Knox points to in his book on *Enthusiasm*, must be held in view. Without doubt it was this "ultra-supernaturalism" which led to the condemnation of Michael de Molinos. The threat to established ecclesiastical order is obvious, and in this sense Quietism spelt Revolution. The balance between "private and public devotion" to which Mr Stanford refers is a very narrow one. The suggestion as to the end of Fénelon's teaching so far as the "focal centre" was to be changed from "self to God" has its bearing upon the interesting subject of Deism. Mr Stanford also devotes some pages to the literary merit of Fénelon's work. His reference to Fénelon's dislike of "intemperate efforts" to convince others and its attribution to a "qualified liberalism" is of some interest in view of later developments in French ecclesiastical history. With regard to the actual selection of Fénelon's letters there is little to remark: they are, in view of his genius, best left to speak for themselves. The tribute to H. L. Sidney Lear's edition in the Editorial Note to Mr Stanford's book is well merited, and he could not have done better than retain Lear's choice of letters with their titles and footnotes.

Ivan R. Young.

Kensworth.

Good Friday at St Margaret's. Edited by Charles Smyth. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

The Wondrous Cross. By H. F. Lovell Cocks. Independent Press. 5s.

In Debt to Christ. By Douglas Webster. The Highway Press. 4s. 6d.

The Mystery of the Cross. By J. E. L. Oulton. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

THE CROSS IN THE CHURCH. By Stephen Neill. Independent Press. 4s.

BENEATH THE CROSS. By J. I. Brice. Mowbray. 4s.

THE MEANING OF THE CROSS. By C. M. Chavasse. S.P.C.K. 9d.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST. By Vincent Taylor. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

HE CAME UNTO HIS OWN. By Jonathan Graham, C.R. Church Union. 4s.

It is not to be expected that small, paper-backed Lenten books will possess a lasting value. But the first book of this bundle deserves a permanent place on book-shelves. It is the record of an experiment over the last ten years of letting the Book of Common Prayer provide the framework of the Three Hours' Devotion on Good Friday. Morning Prayer runs from 12 till 1, Litany and Ante-Communion from 1 till 2, and Evensong from 2 till 3. In the course of each section an address is given. Modifications of the order as observed in St Margaret's, Westminster, set out here, will be necessary where music of this standard cannot be attempted; and these can be easily made. I hope that this little book will mark a turning point in the observance of Good Friday, stemming the torrent of words, often uninspired, subjective, and inconsequent, that is poured out over the docile devout.

Canon Smyth has provided us not only with the details of such a Liturgical Three Hours, but also the addresses given by himself and others on eight Good Fridays. Of these, Dr Wand rightly says in his introduction, "I do not know of any volume of addresses which takes us deeper into the heart of the Atonement."

In his introduction, Canon Smyth draws attention to the loss suffered by the growth of the custom of observing Good Friday as an *historical* commemoration of the Crucifixion separate from the Resurrection. One of the addresses, moreover, insists that, "The words of St Paul, sung in the anthem on Easter Day ('Christ our Passover lamb is sacrificed for us') may serve to remind us that we are not celebrating one act of God to-day and a quite different act on Sunday. The total action of Good Friday to Easter Day is a unity, in which on both days we are commemorating the same redemption under slightly varying emphases and aspects."

The separation of Crucifixion and Resurrection has found its expression in art in the crucifix, which allows one to think of nothing but Good Friday or the cross which speaks only of Easter Day, whereas the Byzantine crucifix spoke simultaneously of Good Friday, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Advent. The separation also finds expression in most of these books. They barely allow the reader to pay attention to any Holy Day except Good Friday.

The Wondrous Cross is an exception. I am not sure that the word "Resurrection" is used in the book. But it is a vivid preaching of the Cross, a Gospelling, full of Good News. It stands foursquare to the Bible and is that moving thing, the preaching of a theologian, of a

man whose head as well as his heart is fully engaged. It possesses both gaiety and solemnity and is full of apt illustrations. A grand book for clergy and laity.

In Debt to Christ is exhortation rather than preaching, fine exhortation, capable of stirring our wills. As befits one who is proud to be a disciple of P. T. Forsyth, the style is exuberant and rombustious, yet without affectation. The suffering of the Cross is the main subject, the suffering of the Cross "transposed" into our lives. It is very good of its kind. So is *The Cross in the Church,* again a Good-Friday-in-detachment book. "Let us get firmly into our minds," Bishop Neill writes, "the four corners of my discourse: (1) The absolute naturalness of the Cross, because of what God is and because of what man is; (2) the obedience of Christ, which does not run upon suffering but accepts it as it comes; (3) the strangeness and disturbingness of the Gospel; (4) our own real participation in the experience of the Cross."

Beneath the Cross is another study of the Seven Words, concentrating on the suffering of the Cross. *The Meaning of the Cross* is a sermon by the Bishop of Rochester in which he is not afraid to speak of "substitution".

The Mystery of the Cross is charming and gentle and Anglican. It seeks to persuade without committing the vulgarity of demanding a decision. I am not mocking: there is a place for books of this kind. Dr Oulton objects to the phrase, Jesus Christ *confronts* us on the Cross. "A similar use is often made of the word 'encounter', which also suggests hostility. To both the same objection may be made, that they are untrue to the general language of the New Testament." Of all this bundle, this is perhaps the book I should re-read first.

With *The Cross of Christ* one steps into a different world, a world whose continued existence I had forgotten, a world in which the Church's Bible-making work is ignored, a world in which the authority of the New Testament books still depends upon the name of the author, a world in which the critical acumen of the scholar is of more weight than the Church's canonization, a world in which it is possible to accord to some of the sayings of the Lord more authenticity than to others. It is a world in which I once lived. Having learned that the Bible is the Church's book, written, collected, selected in order to set forth the apostolic testimony and to act as watchdog upon the Church to keep it faithful to the apostolic testimony, I return with amazement to that world where it is necessary to ask, "What did Jesus himself think?" and where, in order to give the answer, it is necessary to assume that Jesus and the Bible-making Church are at times in disagreement.

I must not mock. It is a book of public lectures; it was addressed, according to the dust-jacket, to professors, students, ministers of religion, and members of the general public interested in religious questions. Perhaps those last four words indicate that it was an audience which would not listen to a preaching; perhaps the first sentence of the last paragraph of the book reveals the approach that was forced upon Dr Taylor: "Such is the account of the meaning of the

Atonement which I present to you for your consideration as a faith for to-day.

He Came unto His Own is a book of a different kind. It attempts to show in what way Jesus is the fulfilment of the Old Testament. An excellent and refreshing book. If all the members of the Church Union read this book (which was the Church Union Lent Book), I am for once disposed to hope that there are many members of the Church Union. Father Graham shows vividly and cogently how we may see Jesus in the Old Testament—cogently, and without unconvincing typological and allegorical fancies. Only on one matter does he falter, as it seems to me. He says that "man sacrifices to God because he believes that sacrifice pleases him". That may, for all I know, be true of other men. But the Hebrew sacrificed to God because God told him to, because God himself provided and ordered this method as the way of rejoicing and of unsinning oneself. Sacrifice, therefore, always spoke to the Jew, not at all of an angry God needing propitiating, but of a gracious God, a merciful God.

F. C. Synge.

The Deanery,
George, S. Africa.

The Limits of Literary Criticism. By Helen Gardner. Oxford University Press. 5s.

These three Ridell Memorial Lectures delivered in the University of Durham take as starting point the striking parallel between the trend of current literary criticism and that in N.T. studies. Dr Farrer, in fact, is just Dr Empson or Dr Leavis with the collar turned round. "Cross-fertilization" might be hard to prove. What is evident is that the professional student in either sphere feels "at home and not at home" on entering the other. Miss Gardner sketches admirably a common revolt against what might be called the liberal tradition of scholarly criticism, emphasizing the background features (influences, composite authorship, sources, dating and all that); and the rise of an "ontological school" which concentrates fiercely on explication of the work *as it stands*. The critic wrestles alone, like Jacob, and will not "let go" until the work tells its inner meaning. His pressure is on the recurrent images and symbols, whose pattern *is* the meaning.

The oscillations of attitude through the centuries are illuminated in "The Drunkenness of Noah". This episode most shocking of all to Jowett and Farrar (the Dean, not the Dr) yields rich edification to a Cyprian and Augustinian—and a Simone Weil. Noah is a Christ-type, the scandal becomes the N.T. *skandalon*, the covering robe is the veil of the Sacrament, etc.

"The Poetry of St Mark" is largely a critique of Farrer. Granting his exciting and brilliant insights, granting that the N.T. reader was "accustomed to look for esoteric meanings", Professor Gardner yet begs to doubt whether those first readers were quite so ingenious and

imaginatively agile as is suggested; also, whether we are really making contact with Mark's mind (rather than Farrer's). The new criticism tends to "evaporate" our sense of historical reality. For all its seriousness it "leaves an impression of intellectual frivolity".

"The Historical Sense" pursues the contrast between the literal and the figurative approaches. Once again the lecturer shows herself to be as much at ease in divine as in profane studies—despite a diffidence about pronouncing on the former. D. W. FOSTER.

HULL.

PEOPLE YOU MEET. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This is an admirable pamphlet, attractively illustrated and produced. It introduces the Christian to some of the large woolly generalizations he is likely to hear from the people he meets; it begs him to consider what is really being said; and it implores him not to let the bubbles go unpricked. There could be no greater service to education than this. Of course, only a very few pompous generalizations can be put in the pillory, but the critical habit of mind so evoked is a habit of mind badly needed by Christians and by others. It is to be hoped that the modest price will mean large sales.

H. C. WALLACE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: C. A. Campbell, *On Selfhood and Godhead* (35s.); The Maharaja of Mysore, *Dattātreya* (21s.); Kātib Chelebi (Trans., G. L. Lewis), *The Balance of Truth* (13s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: D. J. B. Hawkins, *Wittgenstein and the Cult of Language* (1s. 6d.).

GOLLANCZ: Dawson Jackson, *A Primer of Necessary Belief* (14s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: *The Great Mystery of Life Hereafter* (2s.); E. W. Kemp, *An Introduction to the Canon Law of the Church of England* (8s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: *I was an Atheist* (1s. 6d.);H. F. Lovell Cocks, *Behold, Thy King Cometh* (1s. 3d.); William Purcell, *Looking at Ourselves* (1s. 3d.); W. W. Simpson, *Some Prayers Jesus Prayed* (1s. 3d.); E. C. Blackman, *Biblical Interpretation* (12s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Maurice B. Reckitt, *Militant Here on Earth* (9s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: S. Kulandran, *Resurgent Religions* (2s.); Emil Brunner, *Faith, Hope, and Love* (7s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Philip M. Martin, *Mastery and Mercy* (15s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Paul Tournier, *The Meaning of Persons* (21s.); Hugh Montefiore, *To Help You to Pray* (1s.); Gabriel Hebert, *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* (15s.).

SOCIETY FOR O.T. STUDY (LLANSADWRN, MENAI BRIDGE, ANGLESEY): *Book List* 1957 [invaluable guide to books on O.T. subjects published during the year] (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: *To Know Christ* [Daily Meditations] (1s. 9d.); Gordon W. Ireson, *How Shall They Hear?* (9s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

Autumn publications

Studies in Ministry and Worship

A new series designed to provide an ecumenical forum for the discussion of the problems involved in the worship, life, and the mission of the Christian Church. General editor: Dr G. W. H. Lampe, Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham. First titles:

1 **WHAT IS LITURGICAL PREACHING?**
R. H. FULLER 6s net

2 **THE CHURCH'S UNDERSTANDING OF ITSELF**
A Study of four Birmingham parishes
R. H. T. THOMPSON 8s 6d net

THE LIFE OF EDWARD WOODS
OLIVER TOMKINS illustrated 25s net

PARAGRAPHS FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS
Passages to be read by the celebrant in the course of the service of Holy Communion, or used privately by communicants.
DAVID M. PATON and JOHN T. MARTIN 8s 6d net

THE NOTEBOOKS OF FLORENCE ALLSHORN
selected and arranged by a member of St Julian's Community 8s 6d net

SCM PRESS

HOW SHALL THEY HEAR?

GORDON W. IRESON **9s. 6d. net**

Canon Gordon Ireson's insight into the problems of the preacher and into the minds of congregations is remarkable, and makes his book useful to all clergymen and practically indispensable to the ordinand.

A NEW EUSEBIUS

J. STEVENSON *(EDITOR)* **21s. net**

Kidd's Documents *Illustrative of the History of the Church*, now out of print, was for years an indispensable text-book. *A New Eusebius* is based on Kidd. It contains selected passages, in translation and with notes, from contemporary writings, designed to give students the necessary background for the study of Church History from the earliest times to the death of Constantine.

Ready in October.

THE WRATH OF THE LAMB

A. T. HANSON **25s. net**

A study of the Biblical conception of the wrath of God, from its primitive and personalized form in the earliest strands of the Old Testament to its final development, which Dr Hanson finds in the Book of Revelation.

Ready in September.

THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT

R. M. GRANT **15s. net**

Dr Grant, the author of *Second-Century Christianity*, here discusses allegorical exegesis as understood in antiquity up to the time of Origen, with a final chapter on modern theory.

Ready in October.

S · P · C · K